

## REMARKS

Claims 3-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 2 were previously withdrawn. Applicant has now canceled those claims. Claims 3 and 7 have been amended, leaving claims 3-10 for consideration upon entry of the amendment. Support for the amendment can be found at pages 9 and 10. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendment and remarks set forth below.

Claim 3, 6-7, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kawasaki et al. (US 6,424,012) ("Kawasaki"). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the \* \* \* claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 3, 6-7, and 10 include the following limitation: "wherein said mask is configured and dimensioned to prevent impurity doping to a channel region." Kawasaki does not disclose such a limitation.

The Examiner asserts that the insulating film 108 and the resist mask 109 correspond to applicant's claimed mask. However, there is nothing in Kawasaki that teaches that either the insulating film 108 or the resist mask 109 prevent impurity doping to a channel region. See Figures 2A-2D and corresponding description in the specification. In fact, in Kawasaki, the mask is used for forming a LDID region and thus does not prevent impurities doping to a channel region.

Accordingly, because Kawasaki does not disclose that the mask is configured and dimensioned to prevent impurity doping to a channel region, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection as to claims 3, 6-7, and 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 4-5 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Tsai et al. (US 5,814,530) ("Tsai"). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

YKI-0079  
10/008,389

Claims 4 and 5 include all of the limitations of claim 3 and claims 8 and 9 include all of the limitations of claim 7. Thus, as discussed above, Kawasaki does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 4-5 and 8-9 and Tsai does not remedy the deficiencies. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection as to claims 8 and 9.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Lisa A. Bongiovanni  
Registration No. 48,933  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115  
Customer No. 23413

March 9, 2004

YKL-0079  
10/008,389